



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Quite valuable also for the modern Jew is the chapter dealing with the question, whether, as both heathen and Christians claim, God in destroying temple and state has therewith forsaken Israel. It points out that the unparalleled Jewish loyalty and martyrdom are the best proofs that God is with his chosen ones whose optimism is pledge of their future triumph. Also the last chapter on "Israel's History and Religion" furnishes valuable material against the charges of anti-Semitism. In contrast to Friedländer who, through a one-sided study of Hellenism, has become a fierce antagonist of Pharisaic Judaism, our author sees in Hellenism an antagonist of the Jewish faith, whereas as a matter of fact without the Hellenistic elements in Talmud and Midrash, Judaism would have become fossilized legalism. The philosophy of Hellas broadened the teaching of the synagogue without leading to church dogmatism.

K. KOHLER

CINCINNATI, OHIO

NEW LITERATURE ON THE SEPTUAGINT¹

The study of the Septuagint has at no time stood still; but a new stimulus has been given to it by the undertakings of the Cambridge University Press. After Swete's smaller edition and introduction we have now received the first part of the larger edition. The painstaking labor of the editors and printers cannot be too highly praised; and the price is extremely cheap for so toilsome an undertaking. But its scope must be always kept in mind. It is no critical edition of the text, not even an attempt at its reconstruction, but is in the main—a very few readings excepted—a repetition of the text of the smaller edition, which gave, up to 47:28, the text of the Codex Alexandrinus, and then that of the Vaticanus. My own *Septuagintastudien* V (1907) gave a few results of a fresh collation of the Alexandrinus. Thus we have now firm ground under our feet here.²

And the apparatus, too, is very rich and accurate. All uncial manuscripts known at the time of the publication, a good selection of the cursives, the versions, and the most important writers have been used. Few readers will fully recognize the amount of labor bestowed on this apparatus. A

¹ *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*. Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus, Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. Edited by Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean. Vol. I, The Octateuch; Part I, "Genesis." Cambridge: The University Press, 1906. viii + 155 pages. \$2.50.

² Except the division into sections and punctuation; see *Septuagintastudien* V, pp. 6 ff., and note as a curious example 8: 21, 22, where A Chrys and the Aldine and Sixtine editions connect *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς γῆς* with *καθὼς ἐποίησα*. This has been overlooked or neglected even by de Lagarde in his *Genesis Graece*.

symbol, for instance, as "Eus $\frac{1}{15}$ Chr $\frac{1}{88}$ Or-gr $\frac{8}{11}$ " at 1:26, fills little space, but it tells us that fifteen quotations from Eusebius, thirty-three from Chrysostom, and eleven in the Greek parts of Origen have been verified for the passage. A closer scrutiny will, of course, detect some lacunae. No mention is made of the fact that Josephus, one of the most important witnesses, placed the birth of Arpachshad in the twelfth, not in the second, year after the Flood (11:10). The important chronologist Julius Africanus is completely neglected. In 4:26 he has *πρῶτος* as does Origen (and Philo), but after *θεοῦ*. For 6:2 he suggests *ἄγγελοι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, stating that in some manuscripts he found *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*. In 11:12, 13 he omits all mention of Cainan, and in 25:2 the sixth son of Keturah, stating expressly that Abraham had from her *υἱὸς πέντε*. By the way, attention may be called to the fact that most writers on the chronology of Genesis still give 2242 for the Septuagint number of years from Adam to the Flood (Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, I, 197; *Encyclopedia Biblica*, 776 (G^B); *Protestantische Real-Encyclopädie*, 21, 645). This rests on the reading of the Sixtine edition and Origen (see V), giving in 5:25 "167," instead of "187," the latter being attested by Demetrius, Josephus, Julius Africanus, and the corrector of the Codex Alexandrinus. But that 167 is wrong (in my *Septuagintastudien*, V, p. 1, I took another view), probably resting on a combination of the 187 in M and 67 in the Samaritan, is proved by the fact that the better manuscripts which have it, nevertheless kept the number 782 to make up the 969 years of Methuselah, while only later was it changed into 802 (see text and margin of V). In this case the first hand of the Codex Alexandrinus apparently had the wrong readings, the corrector, and therefore also the text of Brooke and McLean, the right ones. But in many places the right readings must be determined from the apparatus, and in such cases it would be a great boon for the less experienced reader if the editors were to mark such readings as they consider right with some sign. The desire to save cost has relegated important notes to the foot of the pages, where, as experience shows, they are frequently overlooked.

This edition will stand worthily with the edition of Holmes-Parsons. The latter, however, will retain its value for the specialist, as will Lagarde's *Genesis Graece*. Still less is Field's edition of the Hexapla superseded by the fragments gathered by Brooke and McLean from their manuscripts. One way in which the new edition must be used has been shown by Johannes Dahse in two "Textkritische Studien," published in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1908, 18 ff., 161-73. The manuscripts must be classified so as to ascertain the origins of the texts. Their most important use is their help in the restoration of the Hebrew text.

At present grammatical studies on the later Greek are in vogue. Helbing's *Grammar*³ has been hailed, like that of Mayser on the papyri, with much praise; dare I say with too much praise? From the standpoint of the classical linguist Wackernagel pointed out several weak points in the book of Helbing (see *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1908, 23). But the Greek Bible is an "east-western" book, and demands for its understanding a knowledge of the eastern languages. How can one treat of Egyptian Greek without any reference to Coptic, and of the Septuagint without Aramaic? For example: Helbing speaks of the assimilation of *έν* in composition (p. 16); in Coptic we find the *ν* preserved, as in NKAKON, and changed into *γ* as in *ἐγκρατής*. Other instances are the discussions on p. 22 on the preservation of *μ* in *ἐλήμφθην* (cf. Coptic *nimphin*—*νήφειν*); on the aspiration of words like *ἐλπίς*, *ἱσος* (cf. Coptic *helpis*, *hisos*., and the transliteration in Latin and Syriac). That Moses is called Μωϋσῆς and Μωσῆς has its full parallel in the name of the Egyptian God Thot, spell Θωυθ and Θωθ, the latter form used according to Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.*, i. 9, 24) by the Alexandrians; (see *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 27, 112). Whether the infinitive of the contract verbs in -όω ends in -οῦν is not considered; in Coptic we find *μαστιγγοῦν*.

Turning to the chapter on the transliteration of Hebrew proper names, we find facts stated but not explained; e. g., Baal, and in compositions mostly Beel-; the latter form is Aramaic; *ἄδωναί*, but *Σινᾶ*; the latter is Arabic. As to aspiration, Helbing recommends the adoption of the rule of Westcott-Hort: "We, therefore, put for *℣* and *℞* the spiritus-lenis; for *Ⲁ*, *Ⲑ* and *ⲑ*, the asper;" as if it were not the first duty of a grammarian to gather the facts of tradition, and then to see whether they may be brought under certain rules.

But apart from this lack of reference to the oriental languages, not even the Greek materials are sufficiently attended to. One cannot write on the Septuagint without Holmes-Parsons; but there is no use of these volumes. In the Book of Judges we have two totally different translations in A and B; they are treated as a unity (cf. p. 54 on *ἀγαθώτερος*, p. 97 on *ἐγένετο*, *ἐγενήθη*). A uses *ἐγενήθη* fifteen times where B has *ἐγένετο*, against five cases vice versa. For the forms in -σαν, p. 67, *ἐπεδράμοσαν* and *ἐτίλλοσαν* are quoted from the Psalms of Solomon. There might have been added *ἐφύγοσαν* from 11:5. But we find no word on the attestation of the manuscripts for these forms; as a matter of fact, they are found only in the manuscripts V and C.

³ *Grammatik der Septuaginta*. Laut- und Wortlehre. Von Robert Helbing. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1907. 149 pages. M. 6.

On p. 51 $\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu = \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ is called a singularity of codex B. Compare, however, $\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\alpha$, $\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu \sigma\omicron\phi\acute{o}\nu$, in the Psalms of Solomon, 3:10; 8:23; but again only in the manuscript V. Helbing is inclined to consider this $\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu$ as original; but it is quite premature to treat the orthographical and grammatical phenomena of these manuscripts as those of the authors, instead of the copyists. The very fact that they occur likewise in the Old and in the New Testament makes against this treatment. It is a pity that von Soden treated these questions almost without reference to the Old Testament, and now Helbing vice versa, without referring to the New. Again it is not safe to treat the Septuagint or even a single book of it as a unity. Thackeray has shown that we must distinguish different hands in the version of the Prophets; but he must be supplemented now by Köhler's investigations published under the modest name of *Beobachtungen*⁴ on Jer. 1-9. He has taken the formula נָאֻם יְהוָה , so frequent in Jeremiah. He has found it rendered by $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, and $\phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$. He finds $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ before Jer. 30:1, sixty-nine times; after it, four times; $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ or $\phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ before Jer. 30:1, once; after it, twenty-seven times. Certainly this cannot be accidental. Thackeray had already fixed the change of hands at 28:69, a little too early according to Köhler, whose observation proves that the different order of the contents in Jeremiah is not due to the Greek translations, but existed in their Hebrew original.

Space forbids to enter more fully into these questions: or to dwell upon the merits of the investigations of Psichari⁵ and Sterenberg.⁶ The book of Helbing is valuable as a collection of materials, especially from the papyri; but it is not exact enough (many of the quotations are disfigured through misprints). I am glad to learn, as I write, that R. Meister has published a much-needed *Prolegomena to a Grammar of the Septuagint*.⁷ I have not seen the work as yet, but I gather from the subtitle that he treats (1) of the textual question; (2) of the influence of the Hebrew original; (3) of the linguistic differences in the several books. This seems to be exactly what we want. We need a minute comparison, for instance, of the two versions

⁴ *Beobachtungen am hebräischen und griechischen Text von Jeremia, Kap. 1-9*. I. Inauguraldissertation. Von Ludwig Koehler. Leipzig: Drugulin, 1908. 40 pages.

⁵ *Essai sur le Grec de la Septante*. Par Jean Psichari. Paris: Klincksieck, 1908.

⁶ *The Use of Conditional Sentences in the Alexandrian Version of the Pentateuch*. Inaugural Dissertation. By James Sterenberg. Munich: Straub, 1908. 69 pages.

⁷ *Prolegomena zu einer Grammatik der Septuaginta*. Von R. Meister (Wiener Studien XXIX, 27.)

of Judges and of Ezra, a minute comparison of the fragments of Aquila and Symmachus—Helbing has references to them, but no systematic comparison; then we may push our way backward to the original Septuagint.

MAULBRONN, GERMANY

EBERHARD NESTLE

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL TEACHINGS OF JESUS

Dr. Sharman has furnished a noteworthy contribution to the study of one of the most complex problems presented by the Synoptic Gospels.¹ Important work upon the eschatological conceptions of Jesus had already been done by competent scholars, work, by the way, which finds no mention at all in Dr. Sharman's pages. But certainly the conclusions reached were vague and hesitating. That cannot be said of the present investigation. Its tone, indeed, is anything but dogmatic. Its processes are carried out, for the most part, with caution and restraint. But whether its methods or its positions be accepted or not, the author has reached certain very definite results which he has formulated with all the lucidity that could be desired.

The book is fundamentally based on a very able and very laborious analysis of the sources. With such care and skill has this been attempted, that the investigation has most important bearings upon the Synoptic Problem as a whole. As evidence of the wide range kept in view it may be mentioned that the first chapter, which deals with "The Sources and Their History," occupies one hundred pages, more than one-fourth of the entire discussion. Dr. Sharman has adopted as the foundation of his source-criticism the analysis of documents reached by Professor E. D. Burton in his remarkable dissertation, *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem*. One may refer in passing to the inexplicable ignoring of these results in recent German works on the Synoptic Problem. It is interesting to note that Dr. Sharman had his material ready for publication before the appearance of Burton's treatise. Accepting Burton's results, he was obliged practically to rewrite his material, "though the conclusions previously reached, both in general and in particular, were unaffected" (preliminary "Statement"). For the convenience of readers, Burton's main documents, G, P, M, and a section of Mark, are printed in sheets, and supplied with the book. This immensely facilitates a comprehension of the method employed.

There can be little doubt that the author has adopted that method which,

¹ *The Teaching of Jesus About the Future, according to the Synoptic Gospels.* By Henry Burton Sharman, Ph.D. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909. xiv + 382 pages. \$3.26.